DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 160 694 UD 018 637

AUTHOR Tsu, John B.
TITLE The Future of Asian Bilingual and Bicultural Education.
PUB DATE [77]
NOTE 6p.; Paper based on a keynote address delivered before the Washington State Asian-American Education Annual Convention (Seattle, May 24-26, 1977); Not available in hard copy due to reproduction quality of the original document

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Asian Americans; Biculturalism; *Bilingual Education; Bilingualism; *Educational Needs; Elementary Secondary Education; English (Second Language); Equal Education; Federal Aid; Federal Legislation; *Immigrants; *Minority Group Children; *Program Development; Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS Bilingual Education Act; *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title VII

ABSTRACT

In this paper, one of the pioneers of Chinese language instruction in the United States reviews the development of bilingual education under public funds, summarizes criticism against it, and proposes approaches and methodologies to improve it. Emphasis is placed on the need to insure the future of bilingual education by paying attention to and answering the criticisms listed and on attempting to solve some of the problems still faced in developing and refining bilingual programs. Continuing financial support is called for, based on the facts that there are millions of children (thousands of them Asians) who require bilingual education, and that immigrant children continue to flow into this country. The doctrine of civil rights and equal education, the favorable Supreme Court decision in the case of Lau Vs. Nichols, and the emergent political power of ethnic groups are also used to illustrate optimism about the future of bilingual education. Recommendations for future bilingual education considerations are provided with particular reference to Asian American culture. (Author/EB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED160694

THE FUTURE OF ASIAN BILINGUAL AND BICULTURAL EDUCATION*

John B. Tsu
Seton Hall University
and
University of San Francisco

Bilingual Education in America has a long history and can be traced all the way back to colonial days.[1] However, modern bilingual education began only in the early 60's when Cuban refugees came to Miami escaping Castro's domination. Among these refugees were Cuban children who did not speak English. Bilingual instruction was devised to meet the needs of these immigrant children. Consequently, a full bilingual program was established at the Coral Way school in Dade County, Florida, in 1963, and from there Bilingual Education spread to Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, California and other states.

The first Spanish Bilingual Program, in Coral Way School, was financed with local funds. When the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was passed in 1965, funds from the Title I Program were used for Bilingual Education.[2] Title I was designed for disadvantaged children and had an annual appropriation of $1.5 billion. It was through the efforts of Spanish speaking people that a Bilingual Education Act was passed by the Congress in 1967 and was signed into law by the President in 1968. It was incorporated into the Elementary and Secondary Education Act as its Title VII. However, the first year after passage of the law, that is 1968, Congress appropriated no money to support the Program. It was not until 1969, that it appropriated $7.5 million for Bilingual Education. The Federal Government has spent nearly $500 million since 1969 with this year's budget in the amount of $135 million dollars.

There are several other laws which have enhanced Bilingual funding. The ESSA and its Title VII also provide funds for Bilingual Programs. The Adult Education Act and the Vocational Education Act also support some Bilingual instruction.

Federal support of Bilingual Education has been an incentive for states and some major cities to initiate Bilingual Programs. Sixteen states have passed laws requiring Bilingual Education in a school district where there are more than 20 (California - 15) children who speak the same dominant language and have difficulties with English. Major cities such as New York, San Francisco, Chicago, Seattle and several others are currently using tax levy monies to conduct bilingual programs. The largest funds, however, comes from ESEA Title VII. For the coming year, there will be:

515 basic programs
32 resources, material and dissimination and assessment centers
560 fellowships and 600 traineeships in 42 universities

Although we Asians are minorities in the bilingual education arena, we were early pioneers in bilingual instructions. The first Chinese bilingual class was accidently established in Seward Park High School, New York City in 1962, a year earlier than the first Spanish bilingual program in the Coral Way School, Miami. I say it was established "accidentally" because it happened this way:

In 1962 I was a pioneer in Chinese instruction in the nation's elementary and secondary schools. I was successful in convincing the New York City Board of Education to offer a course in Chinese as a foreign language to Americans at the Seward Park High School near Chinatown. When the class began, we discovered that 65 per cent of the 72 students enrolled were Chinese, they were all originally from Hong Kong, and they were all experiencing difficulties with the English language. They came to the class to learn English. Therefore, we had to change the foreign language class into a bilingual educational experience. Students were taught Chinese culture through the use of both Chinese and English. This was the recorded beginning of Chinese bilingual instruction. The Seward Park program has continued

*This article is based on a keynote address delivered before the 1977 Annual Washington State Asian-American Education Convention, held in Seattle on May 24th-26th, 1977.

UD018637

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

TSU

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

up to the present time and it received Title VII funding two years ago. Because of this Seward Park experience, I personally began to promote Chinese and Asian bilingual education and have tried to do something for those Asian children who have limited English speaking ability.

Following the Seward Park experience, there were six schools in Community School District I New York City that started Title I bilingual programs in 1968. When Title VII began funding in 1969, two Chinese programs, one in New York City and the other in San Francisco (the Commodore Stockton school project) and one Japanese bilingual program in Honolulu received grants. Later, bilingual programs in these and other major cities started to received federal funding not only for Chinese and Japanese but also for Filipinos and Koreans. Since last year, Vietnamese and the Pacific languages were also added to the funding categories. At the present time we have:

30 Basic Program in 153 schools
9 Institutions offer Fellowships and conduct Training Programs
8 Material and Resources Centers

In the years since Congress passed the bilingual Education Act, thinking on the subject has gone through two different stages. The first stage was from 1968 to 1974. We are in the midst of the second stage which will terminate next year when the law has to be renewed. It will bring us into the third stage of bilingual education.

During the first stage of bilingual education, pilot demonstration programs were established in schools throughout the country. During this period, the Congress and the public came to recognize the need for bilingual instruction while instructional typologies and models were designed by such scholars as William Mackacy, Joshua Fishman, Bruce Gaarder, Theodore Andersson and many others.

The current second stage of development has been marked by the establishment of training programs in colleges and universities and the organization of national network of centers. During the remaining period of this stage, we must refine our definitions, typologies, and models for bilingual education developed during the first stage, and we must evaluate corrective measures which have been taken since the enactment of the 1967 law.

During the projected third stage, which will begin in 1979, those of us who are in the profession must try to do the following: First, we must answer the critics of bilingual education. These include parents, community organizations, school principals and superintendents. Some of these say that we have not proved sufficiently that bilingual education is really working, that we are not serving the right population and that we are not solving the problems of bilingual children. Our critics argue that our successes are due entirely to the large amount of money that has been put into the program and the extra manpower we have in the bilingual classes. If these financial resources and manpower were put into a regular or conventional instructional program, they say, that program could be equally successful. They also say that we have not sufficiently proved that children are actually benefiting educationally through bilingual instruction. Our critics claim we are taking time away from learning English, the national language, thus postponing the hour when the children will merge into the mainstream. Some principals and superintendents feel that bilingual teachers are taking away ESL and other jobs from regular teachers. Other school administrators think of bilingual programs as compensatory programs for disadvantaged children and they feels shamed to have such programs in their schools. Some school administrators think of bilingual program as an honors program inposed upon children who have not yet mastered the English language. Still others believe that many bilingual teachers speak English with a foreign accent, which is not good for the children and some administrators even say that bilingual teachers may not be teaching ESL. One of the biggest complaints is that the federal government has spent much money but there is no follow-up program to the bilingual child's performance at college or his career situation in society. Have they been successful? Are they becoming lawyers and doctors or other professionals to the same extent as those Asians who have studied monolingually?[3]

I think that in order to make the bilingual programs a great success, we must pay attention to these criticisms and we must try to answer them as best we can. And we must try to solve some of the problems we are still facing as we continue to develop and refine our methodologies.

1. We must make more concerted efforts to coordinate all the Center's activities so as to rid ourselves of petty jealousies, wasteful duplication, and unnecessary internal competition.

2. We must increase basic school bilingual programs without which other bilingual programs will have no clientele.

3. It is essential that we consolidate fellowship programs. For example, there will be 560 fellows in the coming year. Let us suppose 400 graduate each year. In five years we could have 2,000 fellows graduated from the fellowship program. Where are they going to get jobs? Consolidation is therefore necessary and an increase in basic program is absolutely essential as well.

4. We must make the effort to establish a bilingual clearing house for providing information on bilingual education. Since the NIE[4] is soliciting proposals, I think the Clearing House will come into reality next year.

5. Certainly we must find and develop financial support for researchin bilingual education. Research in bilingual education has not kept pace with developments in other related areas of instruction. More money must be spent in this particular area so that we can develop and test theories relating to bilingual instruction.

6. We must develop ways of evaluating these programs. Bilingual programs of all types need thorough monitoring and evaluation in order to clearly understand and accurately interpret the results.

7. We must bring program design and program results as closely together as possible. As we all know, more often than not, the design of a bilingual program is one thing and the implementation and results of a program are quite different. Efforts must be made to bring them into closer harmony.

8. We must develop sound instructional programs and establish national standards for teacher training programs. There are nearly 50 institutions of higher learning that are involved in bilingual teacher training today. Each has its own instructional philosophy and its own instructional standards. Courses bearing the same title are taught completely differently at different institutions. Therefore some kind of consistent national standard must established.

9. There are many well qualified teachers who are genuinely interested in bilingual education, but who have never had a chance to go through a sound teacher training program for bilingual instruction. We must enchance teacher training programs of all types for this reason. More in-service training programs ought to be provided for teachers who are already engaged in bilingual instruction and to those teachers in other teaching areas who would like to make a lateral transfer.

10. Other problems also require our attention. For example, most bilingual programs, particularly Asian bilingual programs, are serving children concentrated in the major cities, but there are no bilingual instructional programs to serve the children who do not live in large cities and who are scattered in various areas, but who are equally in need of a bilingual education. It could very well be that the number of children not living the large major cities is equal to or perhaps ever greater than the number of children concentrated in the cities. I was told that in the state of Washington 60 per cent of the Asian children are in concentrated areas while 40 per cent are scattered throughout the State. Certainly something must be done for these children. I know Seattle has a travelling tutorial program for these children and I hope other States will follow Seattle's lead in this respect.

In summary, then, we must do whatever we can to build up a solid base for bilingual education while money is available to us. The day is rapidly approaching when we will have to justify our programs and methods to the public and to the Congress.

This touches upon the future of bilingual education. I am optimistic about bilingual education in the next five years; I foresee a very bright future for it. The question in my mind is what will happen after the next five years. What happens will depend upon our joint efforts in conducting, developing, and refining current programs. As I have noted earlier, the Bilingual Education Act, which was passed in 1967, was revised and extended for another five years in

1974, and will expire in 1979. We must work for another revision and extension of this Act next year. Although we lost our "God Father" of bilingual education in the person of Senator Montoya, and although some reports on bilingual education, are not too favorable, I see no major obstacles to the revision and extension of the law, even though the annual appropriation may be cut back from the present level. My optimism is based on the grounds that bilingual education has rested on four important factors:

First. Immigrant children who need bilingual instruction continue to flow into this country.

Second. The doctrine of civil rights and equal opportunity in education forces the federal, State, and local governments to educate bilingual children for whom English is a second language.

Third. The unanimous, favorable ruling of the Supreme Court in the case of Lau vs. Nichols gave the highest judicial support to bilingual education. (By the way, the Lau vs Nichols case is a historical contribution to Bilingual Education made by Asian.)

Fourth. The emergent political power of ethnic groups forces politicians to support bilingual education.

I would like to say a little bit more on the first point: that there continues to be a significant number of children who require bilingual instruction.

The 1970 Census listed the Spanish speaking population as 9 million. That figure is now at least doubled. Currently there may be as many as 20 million Spanish-speaking Americans. This includes the 4 million illegal aliens in this country to whom President Carter plans to give legal status.

Asian and Pacific islanders number 3.5 million. The approximate breakdown of the largest groups is as follows:

	Current Figure	1970 Census
Japanese	about 650,000	591,000
Chinese	600,000	435,000
Filipinos	500,000	343,000
Koreans	250,000	70,000
Indo-Chinese	150,000	

The remainder are Pacific Islanders

One factor worth nothing is that Japanese are more often temporary visitors and short time sojourners in the United States than permanent residents. Filipinos are now the largest of all Asian groups immigrating to the United States and they are the second largest of all national groups to immigrate. They have an annual immigration rate of more than 20,000. If the current rate of Filipino immigration continues throughout the 70's, Filipinos will soon outnumber both Japanese and Chinese in the United States; they will become the largest Asian population group in America.[5] Should this occur, the Chinese and the Japanese will hold second and third place, respectively. Of course it is possible that a special bill may be passed to permit the immigration of Chinese from Formosa, should the United States Government recognize Communist China. Should this happen, the Chinese will probably become the largest Asian group in the United States.

At any rate, the flow of immigration will continue for some time and almost one third of the immigrants are children between the ages of 3 and 18. According to last year's report of the National Advisory Council on Bilingual Education, there are 3 million children who require a bilingual education, but the present programs serve only one-half million of these children. The same report says 439,000 Asian children require bilingual programs, but that only 15,000 of them are being served.[6]

The Civil Rights Act of 1964 provided legal ground for these children to receive an equal opportunity in education. The Law vs. Nichols case made the Civil Rights Act applicable to Asian children, and as a matter of fact to all children who have difficulties with English. We are all convinced that such a bilingual experience in education is a wonderful boon to these children. The ethnic population of 64 million in this country will vote for those who support bilingual education. President Carter, therefore had to pledge his support to bilingual education during his campaign for the Presidenty.

I foresee, therefore, that even after the expiration of another extension of five years, namely in 1984, bilingual instruction will remain in the American educational system. There are about 50 countries in the world today that provide bilingual instruction in one way or another: China, the Soviet Union, Canada, India, Belgium, Sri Ranka, to name just a few. Even though so much money has been spent on the bilingual programs few conspicuous results can be seen. However there is little doubt that bilingual instruction has left a permanent mark on American education.

I foresee that bilingual children will become competent balanced bilingualists, having use of both English and their dominant language. And I foresee that the methods of language instruction, and the pedagogy of classroom management, will be enormously improved because of bilingual education. Bilingual instruction has already made an historic contribution to American education and as it continues to do so, it might well earn the distinction of a forerunner in practical innovative instruction.

What will be the trend in blingual education in the future? Probably multi-cultural education or new citizenship education. What we have to do is to prepare ourselves for such a day. Right now, we must begin to do whatever we can to make bilingual programs a part of the regular school curriculum while funds are still available to us and while there is still time. We must prepare ourselves to be balanced bilingual, bi-cultural teachers.

For example, Asians respect age. Whenever an Asian young lady is sitting and she sees an elderly Asian professor coming toward her, she must stand up to greet him. She may remain seated however, when she greets an elderly American professor coming towards her, because in this country, it is "ladies" who come first. It is important that she acts bi-culturally. Otherwise, the young lady will offend the Asian professor and she will be regarded as an uneducated and uncultured person.

We must try to increase our cross-cultural understanding of other minorities too. We should also make some efforts to guide the development of the new Asian-American culture which is taking shape in this country. Asian-American culture is a new American experience that results from the mixture of traditional Asian culture and American styles of life. It seems that the power of assimilation into American culture is amazingly strong, perhaps stronger than the forces operating during the golden age of the tributary system in China, because an Asian American often becomes more American than Asian and sometimes more American than the Americans. Some of the so-called "free" or "open" American life-styles seem to be particularly attractive to a great many of our young Asian-Americans. We should not forget, however, that the retention of basic, traditional Asian culture is essential in the making of a new experience, which, with the assistance of bilingual instruction, will ensure the success of Asian-Americans.

NOTES

1. For the historical background in details, cf. Theodore Andersson and Mildred Boyer, Bilingual Schooling in the United States (Austin, Texas: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory). 2 vols. Distributed by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 1970. Reprinted by Seton Hall University Press, 1975. Vol. I, chapt. 3.

2. For detailed discussion of bilingual programs under Title I, cf. Annual Report of The National Advisory Council on Education for Disadvantaged Children, 1970, 1971, 1972. (Washington D. C.: Government Printing Office).

3. For more systematic criticism of bilingual education, read the three volumes evaluation submitted to the U. S. Office of Education by the American Institutes for Research (Palo Alto, California 94302), February, 1977. Also see Noel Epstein's critical article appearing in Washington Post, June 5th, 1977 which invited nation-wide attention to bilingual education.

4. National Institute of Education.

5. Cf. Annual Report of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, Dept. of Justice, 1971-1976.

6. Bilingual Education: Quality Education for All Children: Annual Report of the National Advisory Council on Bilingual Education (Washington, D. C.: J. A. Reyes Associates, Inc. November, 1975), p. 8.